

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, claims 16-17, 21, and 24-26 stand objected to for informalities. Applicants respectfully traverse these objections as follows.

With respect to independent claim 16, Applicants traverse the objection because the original disclosure fully supports the recited claim features relating to the first insulation film found only on the channel region and the low density impurity regions. Applicants had already specifically directed the Examiner's attention to Fig. 10 of the present Application as at least one example of the recently amended claim features. Fig. 10D clearly shows the insulation film 65a, for example, to be formed only on the channel region 642 and low density impurity region 648. Accordingly, the cited subject matter from claim 16 is fully supported by the present Specification, and therefore the outstanding objection thereto should be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 25 of the present invention, claim 25 has been amended herein to correct for the typographical error that gave rise to the Examiner's objection for lack of antecedent basis. Accordingly, the outstanding objection to claim 25 should be withdrawn in light of this amendment.

Claims 16-17 and 25-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takemura et al. (U.S. 5,709,065). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the cited reference does not disclose (or suggest) a second insulation film formed on only the gate electrode and the first insulation film on the low density

impurity regions, and covering substantially all of the surface of the first insulation film on the low density impurity regions, as in claim 16 of the present invention, as amended.

The Examiner asserts that Takemura's gate insulating film 104, which is formed under the gate electrode 105 and over the high resistivity regions 111, 112, is analogous to the first insulation film of the present invention, which is formed only on the channel region and low density impurity regions. The Examiner further asserts that Takemura's silicon nitride film 114 is analogous to the second insulation film of the present invention. According to these assertions by the Examiner, however, Takemura cannot read upon the present invention.

First, Takemura does not even teach that the silicon nitride film 114 is used as insulating film. Second, Takemura clearly shows, in Figs. 3 and 4, that the film 114 is formed well beyond the boundaries of only the gate electrode 105 and the gate insulating film 104. The film 114 is clearly illustrated to additionally be formed over the low resistivity regions 110, 113, and also on substantially all of the silicon oxide film 102 that coats the glass substrate 101.

In contrast, claim 16 of the present invention as amended recites, among other things, that the second insulation film of the present invention is formed on only the gate electrode and the first insulation film on the low density impurity regions, and covers substantially all of the surface of the first insulation film on the low density impurity regions. As discussed above, Takemura does not teach (or suggest) any such analogous features.

The Examiner even reinforces the novelty of the present invention in the additional comments provided in the “Claim Objections.” The Examiner expressly states that the gate insulating layer, which the Examiner deems to be equivalent to the first insulation film of the present invention, “is normally and/or commonly [in the art] extended to other regions such as the regions under the gate line, instead of being restricted only in the active region of the thin film transistor.” This express acknowledgement as to what is commonly known in the art, is therefore further evidence as to the novelty of the present invention. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, and for all of the foregoing reasons as well, the Section 102 rejection of independent claim 16 based on Takemura is respectfully traversed.

Claims 17 and 25-26 all depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 16, and therefore include all of the features of the base claim, plus additional features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the Section 102 rejection of these claims based on Takemura for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 16.


Claims 21 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takemura in view of Applicants’ Admitted Prior Art (“the AAPA”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons discussed above in traversing the rejection of independent claim 16 based on Takemura alone. Claims 21 and 24 both depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 16. The AAPA is cited only for suggesting a motivation for how one skilled in the art could guess at the

thickness limitations recited in claims 21 and 24, respectively. Although Applicants submit that the AAPA hardly provides sufficient motivation to suggest all of the limitations recited in claims 21 and 24, this point need not be argued because the base Takemura reference is deficient for at least the reasons discussed above.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application, including claims 16-17, 21, and 24-26, is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 
Josh C. Snider
Registration No. 47,954

Customer No. 24978

June 3, 2005

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 360-0080
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315

P:\DOCS\1324\68135\962077.DOC